

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-4, 6 and 7, cancels claim 5 and adds new claims 8-21. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-6 and 6-21.

Filed on even date herewith are Proposed Drawing Corrections so as to correct Element 901 of Fig. 9. Element 901 should properly indicate that application definition data and object structure data are retrieved. An amendment was made to the corresponding discussion thereof in the specification on page 12. Thus, the specification corresponds to the drawings. Entry of the Proposed Drawing Correction and the corresponding amendment to the specification is respectfully requested.

Additional amendments were made to the specification to correct minor errors grammatical and editorial in nature discovered upon review. Also an amendment was made to the last page of the specification so as to add the description of subject matter set forth in claims 2-6 which form part of the disclosure originally filed on July 12, 2000. Thus, this added description is fully supported by the originally filed application as it was filed on July 12, 2000.

In the Office Action the Examiner alleges that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on July 12, 2000 fails to comply with 37 CFR §1.98(a)(1) which requires a listing of the references submitted for consideration. A listing of such references was provided. This listing can take any form and the use of Form PTO-1449 is merely "encouraged". However, so as to expedite matters, attached herewith is a Form PTO-1449 listing the references cited by the July 12, 2000

Information Disclosure Statement. An indication that such references have been considered is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. As indicated above, claim 5 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claim 5 is rendered moot. Various amendments were made to the remaining claims 1-4, 6 and 7 so as to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 1-4, 6 and 7 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matters be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being unpatentable over Strasnick (U.S. Patent No. 5,528,735); and claims 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strasnick in view of Tesler (U.S. Patent No. 6,259,451). As indicated above, claim 5 was canceled. Therefore, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claim 5 as being unpatentable over Strasnick is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection with respect to claim 5 is respectfully requested.

The above noted rejections of the remaining claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 1-4, 6 and 7 are not taught or suggested by Strasnick or Tesler whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the above noted rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a spatial data relationship displaying method and system including acquiring server definition data representing an outline of a server, application definition data representing an outline of an application, server object property structure data which corresponds to the server and application object property structure data which corresponds to the application, generating a relationship between an object of the server and an object of the application based on the server definition data, application definition data, object property structure data and thesaurus data, displaying object hierarchical structure data of the server and object hierarchical structure data of the application with the generated relationship on a display, displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by an indication device on the display and modifying and deciding the relationship between the objects based on a confirmation operation input from the indication device.

By use of the above described features of the present invention it is possible to provide an interface which can be used by different organizations or enterprises that desire to share map information. The present invention recognizes that the data

used to generate map information within each of the different organizations may have definitions and structures that are different from each other and as such require the use of different applications. The present invention overcomes this problem so that any application can manipulate the spatial data by using data which describes the definitions and property structures of the various objects as they exist in the server and the application. Using such data the present invention generates relationships between the objects and displays to the user a graphical representation of the relationships between object hierarchical structure data of the objects of the server and application. Further, the present invention allows for the relationships between the objects as represented by indicated relationships between the object hierarchical structure data to be confirmed by the user by the manipulation of the indication device.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Strasnick.

Strasnick teaches a method and apparatus for navigation within a three-dimensional information landscape. Strasnick teaches that a set of data attributes are defined and a mapping of the set of data attributes into objects displayed within a three-dimensional landscape is performed in accordance with a simulation language. Once such mapping is conducted as taught by Strasnick, navigation through the three-dimensional landscape is permitted. Strasnick also provides a method and

apparatus for displaying a plurality of objects having a common data attribute in the landscape as a plurality of columns of different heights wherein a variation in the height of the column represents a variation in the common data attribute. These features taught by Strasnick do not anticipate nor render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims 1-4, 6 and 7.

Particularly, Strasnick does not teach or suggest the objective of the present invention which is reflected by the elements of the claims. The present invention is intended to allow for a first database of spatial data having a first set of definitions and structures to be used by an application which normally performs functions using a second database having a second set of definitions and structures different from that of the first set of definitions and structure. The present invention accomplishes such by acquiring server definition data representing an outline of a server and application definition data representing an outline of an application. In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Strasnick teaches in col. 20, lines 26-27 the step of acquiring server definition representing an outline of a server and in col. 20, lines 28-29 the steps of acquiring application definition data representing the outline of an application. These teachings in Strasnick have nothing to do with server definition data which describes an outline of a server as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 6 and as discussed on page 10, line 8 through page 11, line 9 of the present application. Further, these teachings in Strasnick have nothing to do with application definition data which describes an outline of an application as illustrated, for example, in Fig. 3 and as discussed on page 9, lines 1-20 of the present application.

Therefore, Strasnick fails to teach or suggest acquiring server definition data representing an outline of a server and application definition data representing an outline of an application as recited in the claims.

As indicated above, the present invention recites acquiring server object property structure data which corresponds to the server and application object property structure data which corresponds to the application. Fig. 8 of the present application and the corresponding discussion on page 11, lines 10 through page 12, line 13 illustrate and describe the server object property structure data and Fig. 5 of the present application and the corresponding discussion on page 9, line 21 through page 10, line 7 illustrate and describe the application object property structure data. According to the present invention the object property structure data whether for the server or the application are useful being that they describe structural properties with respect to various elements (parent, child, etc.) that may exist in the spatial data. The acquiring of such object property structure data is not taught or suggested by Strasnick.

Therefore, Strasnick fails to teach or suggest acquiring server object property data which corresponds to the server and application object property data which corresponds to the application as recited in the claims.

According to the present invention, a relationship is generated between the objects of the server and the objects of the application based on the server definition data, application definition data, object property data and thesaurus data. As described above, Strasnick is not intended to provide an interface to allow use of different spatial data with different applications as in the present invention. Thus,

generating a relationship between objects of the server and objects of the application based on server definition data, application definition data, object property structure and the thesaurus data is surely not taught or suggested by Strasnick.

Therefore, Strasnick fails to teach or suggest generating a relationship between an object of the server and an object application based on the server definition data, the application definition data, the object property structure and the thesaurus data as recited in the claims.

In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Strasnick teaches the use of a navigation to warp to hierarchical dependents or children of a cell displayed. However, this teaching of Strasnick is not equivalent to the displaying of object hierarchical structure data of the server and object hierarchical structure data of the application with the generated relationships and displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by an indication means. As per the present invention the relationships indicated in this display are between the objects of the server and the objects of the application. This feature of the present invention allows, for example, the display of the server and application object hierarchical structure data and the relationships between them as that illustrated in Fig. 10 of the present application and as discussed on page 13, line 11 through page 14, line 17 of the present application. Also, as illustrated in Fig. 10 of the present application different ones of the objects can be designated by the user so as to confirm the indicated relationships. These features are clearly not taught or suggested by Strasnick.

Therefore, Strasnick fails to teach or suggest displaying object hierarchical structure data of the server and object hierarchical structure data of the application with the generated relationship on a display and displaying the object property structure data of an object pointed to by indication means on the display as recited in the claims.

As per the present invention as described above, the user is permitted to indicate by an indication device which of the objects being displayed on the screen may be of interest and to confirm the indicated relationships between that object and other objects. These features are not taught or suggested by Strasnick being that as indicated above the object of Strasnick is not to provide for permitting the use of spatial data of one type with applications of another type. Thus, in Strasnick there is no need to allow a user to confirm whether a relationship indicated between objects is correct or not as in the present invention.

Therefore, Strasnick fails to teach or suggest modifying and deciding the relationship between the object based on a confirmation operation input from the indication means as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Strasnick. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(b) rejection of claims 1, 3-5 and 7 as being unpatentable over Strasnick is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Strasnick are not supplied by Tesler. Therefore, combining the teachings of Strasnick and Tesler still fails to teach or

suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Tesler simply teaches a method, system and computer program which optimizes visualization of a navigation through hierarcharies. Tesler, similar to Strasnick, does not teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2 and 6 as being unpatentable over Strasnick and Tesler is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 8-21. New claims 8-21 recite many of the same features shown above not to be taught or suggested by Strasnick whether taken individually or in combination with Tesler. Therefore, the same arguments presented above apply as well to new claims 8-21.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-7.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-4 and 6-21 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-5 and 6-21 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Antonelli, Terry, Stout & Kraus, LLP, Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (500.38695X00).

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 312-6600